Mr. P. Raman Tampi B. A., M. L. (Trivandrum) and Mr. K. Appathura Iyer B. A., B. L. (Nedumangad) mentioned that the subject was brought forward last year and requested early orders as prayed for.

Reply.—Pleaders and judges no doubt experience some difficulty in this respect, but at the same time it is not an easy matter to decide. There are many difficulties in entering the survey numbers of properties in tax receipts. The ryot in many cases does not know the survey number of the land for which the tax is paid and it is quite possible that the property may be wrongly described or a fraud may be committed. Further, the entire lands in a pattah being liable for the tax, no support can be given to the notion that any numbers have been released from liability by their insertion in the tax-receipt. The matter will however be considered and final orders passed.

31. Preservation and maintenance of ayacut, survey and settlement records.

Mr. A. Sri Narayanan Tampi (Vilavankod) said that in view of the information contained in the Dewan's address he had nothing to say on the subject.

Mr. K. Padmanabhan Tampi (Taluk Association, Kalkulam) and Mr. P. Raman Tampi B. A., M. L., (Trivandrum) agreed with Mr. Sri Narayanan Tampi.

Reply.—This subject is engaging the attention of Government. The report of the Committee appointed for the purpose has been received and this has been referred for the opinion of the officers concerned. Their views will be considered and orders passed.

32. Delay in the completion of the resurvey of the cardamom gardens and in the issue of maps for gardens surveyed 12 months ago.

Mr. H. M. Knight (Cardamom Planters' Association) said that the present re-survey of the cardamom gardens was the outcome of the representation of more than 300 ryots made to the late Dewan Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao C. I. E. at the Conference held by him at Cumbum on the 30th March 1905. As a matter of fact many ryots held shorter areas of lands than those for which tax was realized from them, while a few fortunate land-owners enjoyed more than they paid

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for. The member submitted that if the old survey measurements were incorrect, the assessment of cardamom gardens based on those measurements would have to be revised after the completion of the present resurvey. He also represented that there was unusual delay in the completion of this resurvey and that maps were not issued even for gardens surveyed twelve months ago.

Reply.—A resurvey was necessary to find out the variations in the extent of holdings which had been brought to the notice of Government since the completion of the original survey. Orders have been already issued to complete this survey and to supply maps expeditiously.

As regards revision of assessment, individual cases, if brought to notice, will be considered and relief given if the rules or practice permits the same.

33. Necessity for the grant of copies of measurement plans from the taluk office.

Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai (*Tovala*) said that under the existing arrangements land-owners experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining copies of measurement plans as they were not issued from the taluks.

Reply.—This is involved in the scheme referred to in subject No. 31.

34. Desirability of apportioning the cost of boundary demarcation stones between registry holders and those in whose names lands may be registered hereafter instead of from the former alone as is now done.

Mr. Kanakku Mathevan Mathevan (*Nedumangad*) said that the present practice was to realize the cost of demarcation stones from land-holders in proportion to the amount of assessment fixed upon their lands. As this was not an equitable mode of apportionment, the member requested that the whole area of the taluk should be taken into consideration for purposes of calculation and the cost incurred by Government on this account rateably divided between both registered and unregistered lands. As the latter came to be gradually registered, the amount due on account of planting demarcation stones on them might also be realized from the proprietors concerned.

Reply.—There is, no doubt, some hardship and the apportionment does not seem to be equitable. I do not see why the cost should not

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly